

Remarks

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action of October 31, 2007. As of the Office Action, claims 1-24 were pending and all claims are rejected. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of all of dependent claims 2-4, as well as several additional limitations not previously addressed. Claim 21 is amended to more specifically identify a particular article and to incorporate other limitations not previously addressed. New claims 25 and 26 are also added. Claims 2-4 and 23-24 are cancelled without prejudice. Support the amendments is found at least at paragraphs [0010], [0015], [0033], [0034] and throughout the application as originally filed. No new matter is presented.

Applicants respectfully submit that the new grounds of rejection are insufficient to overcome Applicants' prior arguments. Nevertheless, Applicants' amendments to the claims obviate the current rejections, as none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or fairly suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 1 or 21, or any claims depending therefrom. Specifically, as to claim 1, none of the references disclose or fairly suggest the claimed method of applying an optical coating and employing the specific combination of materials. Likewise, as to claim 1, none of the references disclose or fairly suggest the claimed method of applying an optical coating to a combustor liner of a gas turbine engine or that the method allows the optical coating to be applied without a line of sight deposition relative to the article surface.

Applicants further respectfully submit that the limitations of new independent claim 25 and new dependent claim 26 are also not fairly disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record. Specifically, as understood by Applicants, none of the references disclose or fairly suggest applying an optical coating to a gas turbine engine through the use of a plurality of optical transfer pieces having a regular geometry.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Application and withdrawal of all outstanding rejections. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are not anticipated by, nor rendered obvious in view of; the cited art either alone or in combination and thus, are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant requests allowance of all pending claims in a timely manner.

This Response has been filed within five (5) months of the mailing date of the Office Action and it is believed that the only fees due with the filing of this paper is \$460 for a two months' extension of time in which to file this response. In the event that Applicant is mistaken in these calculations, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any fees determined by the Patent Office to be due from the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-1059.

Dated: March 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC

/Shawn K Leppo/

Shawn K. Leppo
Reg. No. 50,311
100 Pine Street
P.O. Box 1166
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166
Attorney for Applicant

Phone: (717) 237-5218
Fax: (717) 237-5300